



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

visitors to his cell are apt to be so hypnotized by their reading and their own fancy that they fail to discover the exaggeration.

The typical rascal is never the hero that romance, whether in the dime novel or the newspaper, pictures him. His intelligence is, as a rule, of a very low order, confined to keenness and cunning, which act in the narrow circle of first preying upon his victims and then trying to outwit justice. Compare it with the intelligence which works for good. His courage is generally greatly overestimated. He rarely fights except when he has the overwhelming advantage, or when he is driven into a corner. His magnanimity and amiability—qualities especially credited to him by writers and readers of the low romantic school—are myths. They are no part of his business, save as they serve to cloak his villany. Pure selfishness, or at best physical temperament, is at the bottom of his good humor, apparent generosity, and even his family affection, for when the crucial test comes he will sacrifice anybody and everybody to self. The proverbial "honor among thieves" holds good only up to a certain point. The moment it becomes clear that no advantage, direct or indirect, remains to the individuals of the gang, the vaunted honor is thrown to the winds, the gang disbands, each clutches what he can from the wreck of their common fortunes, and henceforth preys upon his former pals with no more compunction than he feels in preying upon the rest of the world.

Better acquaintance with them would soon disarm the fascinating villains who play such havoc with susceptible hearts. George Eliot's "Tito" was the handsomest and cleverest of the whole precious fraternity. But she allows no one to be charmed either with his "loathsome beauty" or his fiendish cleverness. She makes you so intimate with him, and so soon, that you have no chance to be charmed before you are horrified and disgusted. One isn't inclined to pet a venomous reptile very long, however brilliant its scales or graceful its curves.

Beautiful evil! heroic villany! They have no existence save in the imagination of the poet and the romancer. In real life they are impossibilities. Such beings as Milton's magnificent "Satan" and Goethe's graceful "Mephistopheles" could no more exist than a hippogriff or a minotaur. Their nearest possible realizations would be simply detestable, horrible.

EDWARD C. JACKSON.

#### AMERICAN SCHOOL HISTORIES ON THE REVOLUTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW :

SIR.—It seems to me, with all deference, that Dr. Goldwin Smith in your September number does not give sufficient attention to the statement in Higginson's History: "Probably they would not have objected if they had been represented in the British government, so they could at least have had a voice in deciding what their taxes should be; *but this was not allowed them.*" Such representation was never asked for, and therefore it is surely a perversion of the facts of history to say it was not allowed. On the other hand, the colonies spurned in advance any contemplated offer of such representation. The circular letter dated February 11, 1768, addressed to the other legislatures by that of Massachusetts, cited in Murdoch's *Nova Scotia*, Vol. II., p. 483, after urging the illegality of taxation without representation, proceeds: "This House further are of opinion that their constituents cannot by any possibility be represented in the parliament, and that it will

be forever impracticable that they should be equally represented there, and consequently not at all." Further on the statement is made: "This House think that a taxation of their constituents even without their consent, grievous as it is, would be preferable to any representation that could be admitted for them there." Nor do any of the school books cited by the Professor seem to point out that accredited agents of the colonies in London admitted that parliament could constitutionally impose on the colonies an external tax, by duties on imports, but not an internal tax, like that sought to be raised by the Stamp Act; that the latter was abandoned, and the admitted authority was not exercised in an oppressive manner.

The Professor says: "The acrimony and the space allotted [in the school books] to the vindication of the Revolutionary War diminished with the increase in the distance of the date of publication from that event." As time bears us still further from the period of the struggle perhaps some wiser and more impartial generation may decide that more moderation on the part of the popular leaders, and an honest and strenuous endeavor by them to suppress mob violence, and the wanton wholesale destruction of the property of innocent people, would have rendered the "great schism" as impracticable and unnecessary as a separation between the North and South was in 1861.

It does not appear what prominence is given in American school histories to the "Acts for the Pacification of America," passed by the British Parliament February 17, 1778. I have heard well-informed Americans say they never heard of them.

A. W. SAVARY.